REMARKS

The informalities in Claims 5, 7, 9, and 17, remaining reference numbers, have been canceled.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 12-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. 6,101,413 (Olson et al.) Amended Claim 1 describes a method for identifying an electrode type in an automatic external defibrillator comprising the steps of providing on an automatic external defibrillator electrode package which includes an electrical connector for coupling an electrode to the defibrillator, a shaped conductive label having a conductive path that uniquely identifies a type of electrode contained therein; coupling the electrode electrical connector to an electrode connector of the defibrillator; and coupling one or more pins to the shaped conductive label when the automatic external defibrillator electrode package is coupled to the defibrillator. By this method a defibrillator can use a common electrode package for different types of electrodes such as adult electrodes, pediatric electrodes, and training electrodes. All that is needed is to affix a shaped conductive label to the package with a conductive path uniquely identifying the type of electrode in the package. The electrode electrical connector is coupled to an electrode connector of the defibrillator and when the electrode package is coupled to the defibrillator, conductors read the conductive label to identify the electrodes. There is no need to put any identifying components inside the package, and no need to complicate the electrode circuitry with specialized circuits to identify the electrodes, which is done by the conductors reading the conductive path of the label. Claims 5, 6 and 16 specify that it is the shape of the label which identifies the electrode.

Olson et al. describe various components which can be attached to an electrode 50 inside the electrode package 60 to

identify the electrode. In Fig. 10 the component is a passive component such as a resistor, capacitor or inductor. In Fig. 11 the component is an active component such as a read-only memory device. The component is connected to the lead wires 56 of the electrode 50. The value of the passive component is measured by a measuring means 100 or 402 and the measured value indicates the electrode type. In the case of the active component, the component is energized by an energizing means 404 to enable data stored in the device to be read by a processor 74 to identify the electrode. All of these embodiments require that an additional component be included in the electrode package. In the case of the passive component, additional circuitry must be connected to the electrode connector 32 of the defibrillator to measure the value of the component. It is never desirable to attach unneeded circuitry to the life-saving electrode circuitry of a defibrillator, where reliability is of paramount concern. Furthermore, a mis-reading of the measured value can cause the defibrillator to perform improperly. In the case of the active component 418, power leads must be brought into the package, and another connection must be provided for reading the data generated by the component, further increasing the complexity and cost of the package.

With a shaped conductive label of the present invention, the label can simply be adhesively attached to the finished electrode package. A conductive label is generally far less expensive than an active or passive electrical component. No wires or measuring circuits need to be connected to any extra component inside the package or to the electrode circuit. Conductors simply read the shaped conductive label. If a part of the label connects two conductors, the impedance of the path is virtually zero; if two conductors are unconnected the impedance is infinite. There is no problem with discriminating between measured values of resistors, capacitors, or inductors. A shaped conductive label is

nowhere shown or suggested by Olson et al. Making a decision based on the shape of a label is nowhere shown or suggested by Olson et al. For all of these reasons it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 12-17 and 19 cannot be anticipated by Olson et al.

Claims 4, 8, 10 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Olson et al. in view of US Pat. 6,018,683 (Verness et al.) It should first be noted that Verness et al. do not show or suggest the use of a shaped conductive label, nor do they suggest making a decision based on the shape of a label. Verness et al. describe a lead for an implantable pacemaker or other device which has a coiled conductor 116 for primary use. If the coiled conductor becomes fractured, a stranded conductor 118 in parallel with the coiled conductor should continue to provide electrical continuity. Verness et al. stands for redundant electrical components, and no more. Verness et al. do not show or suggest redundantly sensing two or more portions of a shaped conductive label, as the Examiner asserts is taught at col. 3, lines 32-35 of Verness et al. At the end of the coiled and stranded conductors the two are crimped together by ferrule 369 which has a crimp 370. No spring-loaded pin is shown or suggested as the Examiner says is taught at col. 9, lines 58-67. With a shaped conductive label absent from both Olson et al. and Verness et al., it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these two patents cannot render Claims 4, 8, 10 and 18 or any other claims of this application unpatentable.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Olson et al. in view of US Pat.5,989,053 (Wheeler). Wheeler was cited for its teaching of the use of gold plating of electrical connectors. Claim 11 recites the use of shaped conductive labels with a gold-plated metal, and shaped conductive labels are not shown or suggested in either Olson et al. or Wheeler. For this reason it is respectfully

submitted that the combination of Olson et al. and Wheeler cannot render Claim 11 unpatentable.

The prior art made of record and not applied has been reviewed and is not believed to affect the patentability of the above claims.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the informalities of the claims have been resolved, that Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 12-17 and 19 are not anticipated by Olson et al., and that Claims 4, 8, 10, 11 and 18 are patentable over any combination of Olson et al., Verness et al., and Wheeler. Accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 12-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and of Claims 4, 8, 10, 11 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ERIC JONSEN

By: /W. Brinton Yorks, Jr./
W. Brinton Yorks, Jr.
Reg. No. 28,923

Philips Electronics
22100 Bothell Everett Highway
P.O. Box 3003
Bothell, WA 98041-3003
(425) 487-7152
March 3, 2008